

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-5 are rejected.

The Abstract has been objected to.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gräser
(Technological Solutions to Autonomous Robot Control, 1998).

The Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Rejection of claim 5 as being indefinite

The Applicants respectfully amend claim 5 to overcome the above rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Rejection of claims 1-5 as being anticipated by Gräser

Claim 1 is amended to replace the term “superior control portion” with “teaching control portion” to further clarify the subject matter of the invention. The teaching control portion is clearly described in paragraphs [0038], [0040] and [0043] as well as Figs. 3 and 4 of the published Application.

The Examiner has cited Gräser, which is nothing more than a position paper that describes some functionalities that are desirable in a robot to assist disabled people. In other words, Gräser does not have enabling disclosure for the subject matter that the Examiner contends to be its teaching. In fact, when referring to Gräser, the Examiner uses the phrase “as

best understood,” thereby admitting indirectly that the disclosure is not clear. The Examiner has not satisfied his burden of establishing anticipation by clearly showing where each limitation of the claim is disclosed in the cited reference.

For example, the Examiner refers to the computer system shown in Fig. 5 to be equivalent to the superior (teaching) control portion. However, there is no disclosure in Gräser that the computer system is used to control robot controller or the image processing portion. Fig. 5 of Gräser merely shows the computer system to be connected to various other components in the figure.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. MPEP citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir.1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Id.* citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The Examiner has not established anticipation of claim 1 by Gräser at least because the Examiner has not shown where a teaching control portion is disclosed in Gräser.

Claim 2 is a method claim that includes several limitations analogous to claim 1, therefore the arguments discussed above should be analogously valid. In addition, claim 2 requires shifting the robot to a position where a characteristic part is detected by the image pickup member and determining a position of the characteristic part in a coordinate system of the image pickup member. Then the position in the coordinate system of the image pickup member is transformed to a position in the coordinate system of the robot.

The Examiner refers to section 5 and Fig. 2 of Gräser in support of his position. However, in these sections as well as in the beginning of section 6, there is merely a general teaching regarding controls. The above steps are not specifically disclosed. For example, in section 6 there is a general mention about kinematics and inverse kinematics. However, such a general mention of kinematics and inverse kinematics cannot be considered to be a specific disclosure regarding the steps that are discussed above. In this regard, the Examiner has again failed to establish anticipation of claim 2 by Gräser.

Claims 3-5 are dependent on claim 2 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 2, 2009

Chid S. Iyer
Registration No. 43,355